

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1 and 3-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-10, 15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US Patent 6,243,707) in view of Wugoski (US Patent 6,690,392). Claims 11-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Wugoski as applied to claims 1-10 above, and further in view of what was well known art at the time of the invention.

By this Amendment, Applicant hereby amends claim 1. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-10, 15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US Patent 6,243,707) in view of Wugoski (US Patent 6,690,392).

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, “wherein when device information and the remote control service list information are received from a certain device, the database server matches the device information with the remote control service list information in order to register in a database of the central storage unit. The Examiner alleges that a proposed combination of Humpleman and Wugoski would render claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s proposed combination of Humpleman and Wugoski fails to disclose “wherein when device information and **the remote control service list information are received from a certain device**, the database server matches the device information and the remote control service list information in order to **register in a database of the central storage unit**” as recited in amended claim 1.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the database server of claim 1 of the present invention corresponds to the session manager disclosed in col. 9, lines 43-48 and col. 14, lines 38-42 of Humpleman. Humpleman discloses the feature that the session manager sends the command and the control information to the managed device in col. 14, lines 38-42. However, Humpleman fails to disclose the feature that the database server collects the remote control service list information and manages the collected information.

Specifically, referring to page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the remote control service list information recited in claim 1 corresponds to the HTML file disclosed in col. 7, lines 38-48 of Humpleman. However, referring to col. 7, lines 16-48, the HTML file is stored in the home device 204, and the DTV 202 receives the HTML file and displays the contents of the HTML file using a GUI on its screen. That is, Humpleman teaches that the HTML file is directly displayed on its screen in a GUI format without being registered in a specific database. At best, Humpleman discloses a that the HTML file is stored in a temporary database in the DTV 202, while the GUI is displayed by the DTV 202.

On the other hand, the remote control service list information, as recited in claim 1, is received from each respective device, is registered in the central storage unit, and then is used by the remote control proxy server.

Accordingly, as recited in amended claim 1, “wherein when device information and the remote control service list information are received from a certain device, the database server matches the device information with the remote control service list information in order to register in a database of the central storage unit” recited in claim 1 is not disclosed in Humpleman. Rather, Humpleman discloses that the DTV 202 may receive and interpret the HTML files in order to graphically display the GUI associated therewith. As noted in col. 7,

lines 6-8, the DTV 202 may display the GUI *without having to know any specific details about the device* which has transmitted the HTML file. Thus, Humpleman clearly does not match device information to a remote control service list information, as recited in amended claim 1.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the remote control service list information corresponds to the macros disclosed in col. 7, lines 58-61 of Wugoski. Referring to col. 7, lines 58-61, Wugoski discloses that the macros are stored in the information handling system. However, Wugoski fails to disclose that the macros are matched with the device information and that the macros are received from a certain device, as is recited in amended claim 1 with respect to the remote control service list. In addition, Wugoski also fails to disclose that the remote control service list information is registered in the database. Therefore, Wugoski cannot cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Humpleman, and the claim limitation “wherein when device information and the remote control service list information are received from a certain device, the database server matches the device information with the remote control service list information in order to register in a database of the central storage unit” recited in claim 1 is not rendered obvious by a proposed combination of Humpleman and Wugoski.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Examiner’s proposed combination of references, as the references, taken individually or in combination with one another, fail to disclose each of the features of amended claim 1.

Claims 3-10, 15, 23 and 24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 11-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Wugoski as applied to claims 1-10 above, and further in view of what was well known art at the time of the invention.

Claims 11-14 and 16-22 depend from claim 1. Because the proposed combination of Humpleman and Wugoski fails to render claim 1 obvious, and because what was well known in the art at the time of invention fails to cure the deficiency noted in the Examiner's proposed combination, claims 11-14 and 16-22 are patentable over the applied art.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 20, 2010